

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Introduction**

In response to the Office Action dated March 28, 2006, claims 8-25, 31 and 32 have been cancelled, claims 26, 29 and 30 have been amended, and new claims 33-46 have been added. Claims 26-30 and 33-46 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

### **II. Claim Amendments**

Applicants' attorney has made amendments to the claims as indicated above. These amendments were made solely for the purpose of clarifying the language of the claims, and do not introduce new matter. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

Claim 26 has been amended merely to replace "the" in line 1 with "a", as Applicants' noticed a lack of antecedent basis for "the lentiviral packaging system".

Claim 29 has been amended merely to delete "HIV", which also lacks antecedent basis and is unnecessary to this claim.

Claim 30 has been amended to make it dependent on claim 26.

New claims 33-46 are supported by canceled claims 9-10 and 13-24, respectively.

### **III. Prior Art Rejections**

At page 2 the Office Action, claims 8-10, 13-25, and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dull et al. in view of Leboulch et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. The amendments to the claims, however, render these rejections moot. Applicants reserve the right to present the subject matter of these claims in a future application.

### **IV. Non-Art Rejections**

At pages 6 of the Office Action, claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 29 was regarded as vague because there is no antecedent basis for the term "the 3' HIV U3 region" in the claims from which claim

29 depends. Applicants have amended claim 29 to delete "HIV" from this phrase, obviating the rejection.

V. Allowed Claims

At page 6 of the Office Action, it was indicated that claims 26-28 are allowed. Applicants have amended the remaining claims so that they depend from one of the allowed claims. Accordingly, all currently pending claims are in condition for allowance.


VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

canady + lortz LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

11340 West Olympic Blvd., Suite 275  
Los Angeles, California 90064  
(310) 966-9400

By:   
Name: Karen S. Canady  
Reg. No.: 39,927

Date: July 26, 2006

KSC/sjm